

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERC United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/088,209	03/15/2002	Hideki Hirano	1155-0245P	1052	
2292	7590 02/09/2004		EXAMINER		
BIRCH STE	WART KOLASCH & BIR	MULLIS, JEFFREY C			
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747 ART UNIT			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1711		
			DATE MAILED: 02/09/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/088,209	HIRANO ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Jeffrey C. Mullis	1711				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app			ldress			
Period for Reply ,							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status				•			
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 No	<u>ovember 2003</u> .					
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This	action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the	e merits is			
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims							
4)	Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	wn from consideration.					
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are rejected.						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		•	•			
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Applicati	ion Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachman	**(a)						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)							
2) D Notic	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	te				
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal Page 1	atent Application (PTC)-152)			

Art Unit 1711

All remaining rejections and/or objections follow.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Kodama et al. (USP 5,290,855) or Kato et al. (USP 5,442,000), both cited by applicants in view of Hirano et al., previously cited.

Note Kodama et al. in Table 5 and the Abstract which disclose a composition containing a combination of PBT and ABS.

Note Kato et al. which discloses a composition containing a combination of PBT and ABS in the Abstract and at column 3 lines 1-21.

Hirano discloses applicant's liquid ethylene/alphaolefin copolymers and also discloses that they have a beneficial effect upon addition to polyacetal or ABS resins in that they increase

Art Unit 1711

the mold releasability and friction wear resistance, note the Abstract.

The two primary references Kodama et al. and Kato et al. do not disclose the presence of applicant's low molecular weight ethylene/alphaolefin copolymer "C".

It would have been obvious to a practitioner having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the ethylene/alphaolefin copolymer of Hirano et al. to the composition of the primary reference motivated to extend the advantages of Hirano et al. to the primary references absent any showing of surprising or unexpected results.

Applicant's arguments filed optionally 12-03 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

The Examiner has reviewed applicant's Table 3 on page 16 of their remarks. However Table 3 on page 16 of applicants' remarks does not present any embodiment of the closest prior art which appears to be either Kodama et al. or Kato et al. in that both references recite materials not explicitly recited by the instant claims but which are not excluded from the instant claims.

Furthermore with regard to Kato et al., Kato et al. does not utilize 5 parts of graft copolymer as recited in Comparative Example 7 of Table 3 on page 16 of applicant's remarks but rather

Art Unit 1711

utilizes a minimum of 10 parts per 100 parts of PBT. Lastly, the secondary reference Hirano specifically discloses that the addition of the low molecular weight ethylene/alphaolefin copolymer to an ABS resin will increase mold releasability and friction wear resistance. Therefore while the results of Table 3 and Examples 6 and 7 may be an improvement over Comparative Example 7 in Table 3, such an improvement is not unexpected based on the teachings of Hirano et al. since rather such improvement would appear to flow naturally from the teachings of Hirano et al.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE

Art Unit 1711

STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey Mullis whose telephone number is (571) 272-1075. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 to 6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck, can be reached on (571) 272-1078. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-0994.

J. Mullis:cdc

February 3, 2004

JEFFREY C. MULLIS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1200